

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21, 23-25 and 27-37 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 13, 18, 25, 33 and 35-36 are amended, and claims 26 and 38 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments or the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,545 to Flanagan et al. (hereafter "Flanagan") and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0139076 to Pendleton. Since the references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest features recited in the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

(1) Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Flanagan with Pendleton. Applicant respectfully submits that Flanagan discloses a mobile device 3A which, for example, could be a desktop assistant, PDA, palm top computer, phone or pager, personal information manager (PIM). See column 1, lines 31-45, column 6, lines 25-45, column 12, lines 49-58 and Figures 3-4. The mobile device 3A can include operating system 98, application programs 5A-5C for example in memory 90. As such, the mobile devices are small electronic computing devices with limited size, weight and memory and computing power. See column 1, lines 31-45 of Flanagan.

In contrast, Pendleton discloses service providers 4, 6, 8 such as a hospital or doctor's office, individually entering and remotely transferring information over the internet 20 to insurers 14, 16, 18 that are located in separate physical locations via server 22. A medical service provider has complex data keeping requirements to legally satisfy and may have a complicated database stored on a general purpose computer with records for each patient treated and accordingly can include data for millions of patients. Insurers include information on all insured patients including coverage information and individual transactions regarding that patient that must also satisfy complex legal data keeping requirements. The server 22 includes a complex system to receive information from remote medical service providers for conversion and then transmission to a remote insurer. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that even individually, the processing requirements and scope of information used by the service providers 4, 6, 8 or the server 22 or the insurers 14, 16, 18 would not be capable of operating on a PIM. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits it would not be obvious to combine Pendleton and Flanagan as asserted in the Office Action. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider a complex system disclosed in Pendleton as capable of operating small electronic computing devices with limited size, weight and memory and computing power disclosed in Flanagan. Applicant does not see any disclosure in Pendleton how to simplify any of the complex individual components or the networking capability to modify such capabilities to a PIM.

(2) Further, Applicant respectfully submits that even if Flanagan and Pendleton had been combined, the combination would not have resulted in features recited in the claims. With respect to claim 1, for example, Applicant respectfully submits that Flanagan and Pendleton, individually or in combination would not result in at least features of a

method for storing data in a personal information terminal (PIT) including composing data in a first application program of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PIT, the data being of a first format, converting a format of the composed data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program, and storing the format-converted data in a database associated with the second application program, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively operated in the PIT as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action admits Flanagin does not teach converting a format from a first format to a second format suitable for a selected second application program and storing the format-converted data in a database associated with the second application. See Item 4 on lines 1-3 of page 3 of the Office Action.

The Office Action asserts Pendleton discloses converting a format from a first format to a second format citing paragraphs 1, 6, 10 and 26-28 of Pendleton. However, Applicant respectfully submits Pendleton does not teach or suggest converting a format of the composed data from the first format to a second format, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively operated in the personal information terminal and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that Pendleton discloses the medical service providers 4, 6, 8 enter data at their physical location where the medical services are being provided. Similarly, the insurers enter the data where the insurance processing is being performed. Finally, Pendleton discloses that such locations are remote and are connected over internet 20 via server 22. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Pendleton does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of composing data in a first application program, converting a format of the composed data from the first format to a

second format, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively operated in the personal information terminal and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that paragraph 6 in Pendleton discloses a medical service provider has a medical service application program and a data entry application program, but does not teach or suggest a medical service provider with an insurance provider application program let alone a conversion application program. Further, Pendleton discloses a server 22 has a conversion routine (e.g., conversion routine 54).

3) With respect to claim 18, Applicant respectfully submits that Flanagan and Pendleton, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of converting a format of the composed data to a second format used by the second application program, wherein the first application program is a document editing program, and the second application program is each one of a contact manager, an appointment scheduler, a telephone organizer and a task list and combinations thereof as recited.

The Office Action admits that Flanagan does not teach or suggest converting a format of the composed data. Pendleton discloses converting data from a medical service provider format to an insurer format. Applicant respectfully submits that Pendleton does not disclose converting composed data, wherein the data is composed in a document editing program.

4) Applicant respectfully submits that Flanagan and Pendleton do not teach or suggest a plurality of different data entry procedures for an application program. Thus, claim 13 defines patentable subject matter.

5) With respect to claim 25, Applicant respectfully submits that Flanagan and Pendleton would not result in at least features wherein contents of the data entered in the first application program in the PDA are stored as re-formatted data in the second database in the PDA to match the second database to the first database while the first application program is executed and combinations thereof as recited. Applicant respectfully submits that in Pendleton the data entry by the service provider in an application program would necessarily be terminated to transmit data via the internet 20 to the server 22.

Further Applicant respectfully submits that Flanagan does not teach or suggest converting from different types of applications, but merely disclose synchronizing the same type of application program when different computer systems with corresponding versions are connected (synchronized). See Figure 7 and column 12, lines 19-25 of Flanagan.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 13 and 25 define patentable subject matter. Claims 18 and 36 define patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 1. Claim 33 defines patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 25. Claims 2-12, 14-17, 19-21, 23-24, 27-32, 34-35 and 37 depend from claims 1, 13, 18, 25, 33 and 36, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as their additionally recited features. Claims 26 and 38 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-21 and 23-38 under §103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Serial No. 10/036,378
Reply to Office Action of June 5, 2006

Docket No. LT-0010

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carl R. Wesolowski**, at the telephone number listed below.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/CRW:vrj:cah
Date: August 11, 2006
Q:\Documents\2031-005\101270.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610